A

SECOND POST-SCRIPT

TO

Enthusiasm in Distress.

Occasioned by

Mr. NISBETT's Second Letter,

Intitled,

Comprehension Confusion.

Address'd to Mr. *NISBETT*,

By THOMAS MORGAN, M. D.

LONDON:

Printed for *J. Billingsley*, at the *Judge's Head* in *Chancery Lane*; and sold by *J. Roberts*, in *Warwick Lane*, *S. Chandler* in the *Poultry*, and *J. Brackelsby* near the *Exchange*. 1724. Price 4*d*.

BRITISH MUSEUM

SIR,

I Have juſt now received the ſecond Letter with which you have honoured me from the Preſs, in Defence of your good Friend the Author of the *Reflections upon Reaſon*; for which I find myſelf obliged to return you my Thanks, and to make the Acknowledgment as publick as the Obligation. I am very certain, that nothing can contribute more to the Honour and Advantage of that Chriſtian Liberty, or Religious Comprehenſion, which I have been pleading for, than your Way of writing againſt it; and I am therefore extremely ſorry, that after the Offence you had taken at the Funeral of a late Author, you ſhould chuſe to act over the ſame Tragedy upon yourſelf, by reſolving to depart, in ſpite of all the Perſuaſions and Intreaties of your Friends; and that *nothing*, not even the Cauſe and Intereſt

reſt of the *Church*, ſhall ever provoke you to *appear again*. But you muſt give me leave here to tell you, *Sir*, that 'tis not friendly, or benign to Mankind, thus voluntarily to deprive the World for the future of your clear and ſtrong *Reaſonings*, your *maſterly Illuſtrations*, and *judicious Reflections*, which I am well aſſured would do a great deal of Good; eſpecially in ſuch a Time of Common Danger, when all Hands ſhould be aloft to ſave the *Church*, from the confounding Pretenſions, and exorbitant Claims of *Religion*.

However, if it muſt be ſo, if you and I are never to ſee each others Faces more, there is nothing, I think, to be done at preſent, but to underſtand one another, if poſſible, and endeavour to part as good Friends as we can. I muſt own, that I can perceive no Manner of Relation or Connexion between that Kennel of Dirt and Filth, which you have raked together out of Hiſtory and ſome late Pamphleteers, and the Controverſy between your Friend and me. Whether you are in the Right or in the Wrong, as to your perſonal and Party-Reflections, the Argument ſtands juſt as it was, and

you

you have ſaid no more to it, than if you had been all this while only picking your Teeth, or paring your Nails. When I read your Book, and endeavour to find out any one Principle of Reaſon upon which you proceed, or any one Remark, or Hiſtorical Obſervation, that may not be turned with much greater Strength againſt you; I am utterly loſt, and can ſee nothing before me but Dirt and Darkneſs.

I remember my ſelf in reading an Author, to have been ſerved ſo once before: About eighteen Years ago, there came out a Book with a pompous Title, in order to prove the *Copernican* Hypotheſis to be ſenſibly, experimentally, mathematically, and philoſophically falſe. I, who had juſt then taken a Taſte of the *Newtonian* Philoſophy, and ſeen the aforeſaid Hypotheſis improved into Demonſtration, was very impatient to procure a Book which promiſed ſuch Wonders; but when I came to look into it, I found my ſelf ſeized with an unuſual Sort of Giddineſs; every Thing ſeemed to be thrown into Darkneſs and Confuſion, and I could not poſſibly diſcover the Connexion of any two Ideas in the Author's

thor's whole Train of Reaſoning: Upon which, ſuſpecting my own Underſtanding, I laid aſide the Book, and conſulted ſome of my Friends about it, who aſſured me they had been affected by it in the ſame Manner, and it was ſoon agreed on all Hands, that the Author was mad, which afterwards, to the poor Gentleman's great Misfortune, appeared to be really ſo in Fact.

I would not have you here miſtake me, *Sir*, and conclude that I have drawn this directly as a Parallel between you and me; for whatever you may imagine, I have more Diſcretion and good Manners than ſo; but, to be impartial with you, the true Queſtion betwixt us is this, whether you or I are diſtracted? Since 'tis certain, and every Body will allow it, that it muſt be either one or the other.

You tell me, in the firſt Place, with an Air of hypochondriacal Pleaſure, that your Friend the Author of the Reflections, notwithſtanding the Entertainment of a late publick Funeral, is ſtill alive and in good Health; that his Buſineſs and Reputation grow upon him in Conſequence

ſequence of his learned Performance; which he gratefully acknowledges as owing in ſome Meaſure to me.

This I preſume is ſaid to let us ſee, that you cannot write a Page in publick without making yourſelf a publick Jeſt. What I have maintained, and have ſtill Reaſon to ſtand to is this, that your Friend is departed out of the World of Authors, that his *Spirit* ſleeps, and that he has not one Drop of Blood left to be ſpent in the Controverſy. If it be otherwiſe, 'tis he alone who muſt diſprove it, ſince 'tis impoſſible that you or any Body elſe ſhould do it for him. But you, in your great Wiſdom to diſcredit the Report of your Friend's Deceaſe and Interrment, give us to underſtand, that he ſtill lives, and breathes, and *teaches School*, which is what I had never contradicted.

Your carrying the Jeſt ſo far, is turning it upon yourſelf, and your Miſtake argues a very great Want of Logick; as if the ſame Perſon might not be dead and alive in *different Reſpects*; or as if a living *Man* might not be a dead *Author*; and a dead Author a very good and uſeful *School-maſter*.

Your

Your Friend's Talents, I believe, are by this Time ſufficiently known, and, I hope, he will, for the future, obſerve that Proverbial Admonition to which his beſt and moſt diſcerning Friends have adviſed him already, *ne ſutor ultra crepidam.*

The moſt material Paſſage in your whole Book, and without which I ſhould ſcarce have troubled you or the Publick with any farther Reply, is what I find in *p.* 6, 7, where you charge me with *wickedly miſrepreſenting* your Friend, the Author of the *Reflections*; and as *not having the Fear of God before my Eyes*, imputing to him *a horrid Piece of Prophaneneſs*; making him aſſert, *as a Foundation of the Chriſtian Faith*, what *he only mentions as an Objection of the modern Free-Thinkers, whoſe Stile* he there *uſes.*

If I am as wicked and ungodly a Wretch, as you here repreſent me, 'tis certainly fit that I ſhould be treated accordingly, and be brought to publick Confeſſion, Shame, and Repentance. But if I have herein acted fairly, ſoberly, and

in

in the Fear of God, 'tis fit likewiſe the World ſhould know it, and determine what they ought to think of a Man, who can bring ſuch a Charge, without the leaſt Ground, and contrary to the plaineſt Matter of Fact.

You dared not here truſt your Readers Eyes with the Evidence on both Sides, and therefore you choſe rather barely to quote the Pages, and refer him to Paſſages in Books, which he might not have by him, and which, as you muſt preſume, he would not give himſelf the Trouble to look into or examine.

The Objection, as put by the Author, *p.* 33. of the *Reflections*, and as quoted by me, *p.* 18. of the Anſwer, is this, *But the greateſt Difficulty is ſtill behind; and that is the Myſteries of the Goſpel, certain unintelligible Doctrines, impoſed upon us as Articles of Faith, which no mortal Man can explain or comprehend; and yet we are told, that theſe are neceſſary to be believed in order to Salvation*, which *ſeems very abſurd and unreaſonable*. Now how does he get rid of this Objection? Does he deny that theſe *Chriſtian Doctrines* here referred

to are in his own Scheme unintelligible, incomprehenſible, and ſuch as no mortal Man can explain or conceive? Not at all; but he grants the whole Thing and leaves the Objection in its full Weight; only he makes an inſignificant Diſtinction between Things *above*, and *contrary to Reaſon*: From whence he concludes, that theſe *Chriſtian Doctrines*, and *neceſſary Articles of Faith*, tho' they are unintelligible, incomprehenſible, and ſuch as no mortal Man can explain or conceive; yet they may be true for all that, and not contrary to Reaſon; they may be unintelligible, incomprehenſible, and inexplicable *Truths*. Well! perhaps it may be ſo; but then it would be a Contradiction in Terms, to pretend to any Thing of a Revelation in this Caſe, or to ſay, that theſe unintelligible, incomprehenſible *Truths*, are *revealed* without being *made known* to us; and therefore theſe *Truths*, theſe *Chriſtian Doctrines*, and theſe *neceſſary Articles of Faith*, himſelf being Judge, can be of no Uſe or Service to us at all: For he tells us, *p.* 50. that, If the Scripture *be not intelligible, it cannot anſwer the Ends for which it was given; That no Man can be taught, reproved, corrected, or inſtructed by what*

he

he does not or cannot understand, —— and *that it is inconsistent, either with the Wisdom or Goodness of God, to give us a Revelation, to be a Guide to Truth, and the Rule of Righteousness, which is not easy to be understood by every* Honest Enquirer. I press'd this Difficulty upon the Author before, to know how he would reconcile the unintelligible, inexplicable Mysteries of the *Athanasian* Divinity, with the obvious Plainness and Clearness of Scripture, in all necessary Points of Christian Faith and Practice. But this I find is *noli me tangere*, which you have not dared to meddle with yourself, and for which, perhaps, you will not easily forgive me.

I farther urge upon the Author, that his Distinction of Things above Reason, and contrary to Reason, could be of no Use to him here; not only because unintelligible Doctrines can be no necessary Part of Religion, by the Author's own Acknowledgment; but especially, because, as I have proved, 'tis impossible that the Assent of the Mind should, in any case whatever, go beyond the Perception of the Understanding: and consequently an unintelligible Proposition

can no more be the Object of *Faith*, than it is of *Knowledge* or *Perception*. To this you have given no Anſwer, tho' it plainly deſtroys the Author's whole Scheme, and leaves him intirely in the Power and at the Mercy of the *Deiſts* and *Free-Thinkers*.

And now I may ſafely leave it to the Reader's Judgment, whether I had wickedly charged the Author againſt his Principles, or whether you have not wrongfully charged me againſt the plain Truth of the Caſe in Fact. I will not ſay, that this was *wickedly* done of you, and that you had no *Fear of God* before your Eyes; ſince 'tis poſſible it might proceed from you under the Influence and Poſſeſſion of ſome ſtrong enlivening *Spirit*, which leaves a Man for the preſent not ſtrictly accountable for his Words or Actions; or it might be owing to a certain conſtitutional Elevation of the Blood, which ſometimes, after a great Depreſſion, is apt to riſe too high, and carry a Man above and beyond the Sight and Comprehenſion of himſelf, or any Thing about him. Thoſe I find who pretend to know your proper Name and real Character are of

of this Opinion; but as that Matter is nothing at all to me, I ſhall let it paſs.

Having graced your Title Page with ſome grave Impertinences and ſolemn Fooleries, from an Author whoſe Authority is juſt as good as your own, and charged me with Impudence, Preſumption, Wickedneſs, and every Thing that either Weakneſs, or Malice, a cankered Heart, or a diſtempered Head could ſuggeſt; you come at length, *p.* 12. to tell me, that the Queſtion between you and me *ſhall not be, who is in the Right? but whether two and three make five?* The late Author's Queſtion was this, *Whether a Triangle muſt not have three Sides, as well as three Corners?* Which was to determine the Controverſy between the Church and Diſſenters; and you come up ſo near to him in the Clearneſs of ſtating Queſtions, that one might be apt to imagine you the ſame Man. But if two and three make five, then it muſt plainly follow, that as the religious Right and Liberty of Mens acting according to their Judgments and Conſciences has been abuſed, ſo it may be abuſed again, and therefore no ſuch Liberty of private Judgment and Conſcience

ought

ought to be granted, but the Authority of the Church is to be ſubmitted to in all Matters of Religion and Conſcience, under the Penalty of Damnation. If this be not the plain Deſign of all your Rant and Scandal, and of all the ſilly Party-Stories you have raked together, I defy any Man living to put any conſiſtent Senſe, or Meaning at all to it. And that this is your Meaning, I need no other Evidence, than the Addreſs of that Houſe of Commons which you quote and approve, *p.* 17. where they inſtigate their Prince againſt that Indulgence and Liberty of Conſcience, which his Majeſty was inclined to grant: A Piece of Advice certainly, which ought to ſtand upon Record, to the eternal Shame and Diſhonour of thoſe who gave it; and who thought, no doubt, the moſt ſavage and unnatural Perſecution a better Way to ſecure the Peace and Happineſs of the King's Subjects, than religious Indulgence and Liberty of Conſcience. But what if I had now Time and Patience to turn the Tables upon you, and to ſhew from the moſt authentick hiſtorical Evidence, that ever ſince the Civil Eſtabliſhment of Chriſtian Churches, the ambitious domineering Part of the Clergy, thoſe who have been

been for making Creeds, Canons, and Conſtitutions, to bind the Conſciences of Men in Matters of Religion, have ever proved the common Plagues of Mankind, the Peſts and Incendiaries of human Society, and the true Authors and Fomenters of the moſt *general* and moſt *fatal* Miſeries and Calamities that have ever befallen the Chriſtian World? Would you quit your Pretenſions to *Church Authority* upon this Evidence, and lay aſide a Thing that ever has been, and is ever like to be ſo much abuſed? I ſuppoſe not; but you would ask me, perhaps, *how I came by ſuch Stories?* whether I am not miſinformed? and whether theſe Incendiaries have not been ſome other Sort of People *in the Dreſs and Habit of Prieſts and Clergymen?* As to which I ſhould have nothing to anſwer, *Sir*, but only to deſire you to go to Sleep a little; and write again upon this Subject, when your Head is better compoſed: But at preſent you ſeem uncapable of judging about Things that are neareſt Home, and whether the Diſorders and Confuſions you complain of, in our Civil War, might be more owing to *Oliver Cromwell*, or to Archbiſhop *L----d*.

I had

I had ſaid that to allow the Sufficiency of Scripture, as the only Rule of Chriſtian Faith and Practice, and yet to plead for the Neceſſity of other Rules, ſuch as human Creeds, Canons, *&c.* was affronting the Underſtandings of Men, and a moſt ridiculous Banter upon Common Senſe.

Upon this you appear very much hurried and diſtracted, and you run up and down forward and backward, like a Man at his Wits End: Sometimes you cry out, *If all Parties ſhould be laid on a Level*; that is, if nothing ſhould be made neceſſary to Church Communion, but what the Scripture has made neceſſary to Salvation, and if Men ſhould leave the Way into the Church as free and open, as Chriſt has left the Way into the Kingdom of Heaven, this muſt introduce nothing but Diſorder and Confuſion: But then preſently you recall yourſelf, by allowing the Sufficiency of Scripture as the only Rule, and quote the 6th Article of the Church for it.

This then you ſee is a moſt perplexing Caſe. If the Scripture *itſelf*, the Bible

Bible *alone*, be a ſufficient, and the *only Rule*, 'tis evident, that all other Rules, of what Nature, Kind, or Denomination ſoever, muſt be unneceſſary. But if other Rules are neceſſary, and ſuch as cannot be ſpared, 'tis plain, that the Scripture, the Bible, is not a ſufficient, nor the only Rule of Chriſtian Faith and Practice. Now ſuch is your Diſtreſs here, that you are reduced to the Neceſſity of maintaining both Parts of the Contradiction: The Scripture, with you, is a ſufficient inſufficient Rule; and your human Articles, Canons, *&c.* are unneceſſary neceſſary Rules, or needleſs Things, that cannot be ſpared.

You muſt maintain the Sufficiency and Perfection of the Scripture, as the *only Rule* of Chriſtian Faith and Practice, or otherwiſe you would give up the Proteſtant Cauſe, and fall a Sacrifice to the Church of *Rome*. On the other Hand, you are conſtrain'd, by the cleareſt and moſt neceſſary Conſequence, to deny and diſclaim the Sufficiency and Perfection of Scripture as the *only Rule* of Chriſtian Faith and Practice, and maintain on the contrary, that there are certain human Articles Canons, *&c.* that are neceſſary in Point of Chriſtian Faith and Practice, and

without which, the Scripture alone would not be ſufficient. And unleſs you will ſay this, you muſt agree with the Proteſtant Diſſenters, that your Articles, Canons, *&c.* are needleſs at leaſt, if not hurtful. You are therefore crucify'd between theſe two, you hang ſuſpended between *Heaven* and *Earth*, and I can ſee no Help for it, tho' you ſhould make wry Faces to the Right and to the Left, and call them both Thieves.

Your quoting a Popiſh Writer againſt me, as if I could be aſhamed or frighted out of the Truth, becauſe a Papiſt had happened to ſpeak it before me, is weak and trifling beyond all Expreſſion. I muſt declare, that I have never ſeen the Pamphlet which you refer to, from *p.* 44 --- 47. but by what you have tranſcribed from it, the Argument is very ſtrong againſt you, and ſuch as neither you, nor all the High Churchmen in *England*, can ever anſwer.

Now, becauſe this ſeems to be the moſt proper Place for it, I ſhall here ſettle the Account with you, concerning the Authority of the Church, as *eſtabliſhed by Law*. I had maintain'd, that the Church, in this Capacity, could have no proper Autho-

rity

rity at all distinct from the Civil Jurisdiction; because all Authority whatsoever is, by the Laws, and the Church's Oaths, vested in, and derived from, the King's Majesty, and exercised by the Clergy, only as State-Pensioners under the Crown. Now here you have not been able to deny the Principle as Matter of Fact. This could not be done, since 'tis as certain as that there is any such Thing as a Church of *England* established by Law. But you here very unluckily refer me to *Hobbs*'s *Leviathan*, as a Book which you presume I must have by me; and you give me to understand, that if this be so, as I have observed, and which you have granted, it must follow, that the Church is a Leviathan, established upon the Principles of *Hobbism*, which resolve all Religion into the Will of the Civil Magistrate.

But would any Churchman, in his Wits, have drawn such a Consequence from a Principle which he had silently granted, and could not deny? Did ever any Man but you thus betray his own Case, and damn the Church of which he is an unworthy Member?

I desire that this may be taken Notice of here, as your own Inference. No Adversary certainly need to bring any Charge against a Church that is so happy, as to have such a Defender. Nay, to make the Matter sure, you quote *Hobbes*'s own Words, *p.* 45. *We never shall have a lasting Peace, 'till the Ministers know they have no Authority but what the Supream Civil Power gives them.* The *Ministers* then, it seems, know that they have an Authority which is not derived from the Supream Civil Power, tho' they swear the contrary. A fine Compliment, surely, upon *these Ministers*, for which they will doubtless vote you their due Thanks, who, according to your Account of them, must be a Pack of mercenary graceless Wretches, that to secure the Benefits of a Civil Establishment, take Oaths every Day, contrary to their Knowledge and Consciences. But this Perjury will never be at End, 'till the Pretence of Independent Church-Authority is dropt, and 'till *these Ministers* know that they are Subjects, and not Rulers; the Servants, Delegates and Sub-Agents, and not the Lord's, and Masters of the *Church*, or *Christian People*.

From

From hence 'tis plain, that whatever *Church* you and your Brethren are of, it cannot be of the Church *eſtabliſhed by Law*: Since that Church is ſo far from admitting any independent Authority in her Prieſthood, that ſhe obliges all her Clergy to diſclaim it before God and Man by renouncing it upon Oath, and placing all Authority, Eccleſiaſtical as well as Civil, in the King's Majeſty.

I had urged it as wholly indefenſible in the Conſtitution of the Church, that Things confeſſedly indifferent and unneceſſary ſhould be ſuperadded by mere human Authority, and tack'd to the neceſſary Inſtitutions of Chriſt, in ſuch Manner as to exclude from the Communion of the Church, and from the Benefits of the Goſpel, thoſe, who by reaſon of natural Weakneſs, groundleſs Scruples, reaſonable Prejudices, or any other Cauſe whatever, ſhould not be able to comply with theſe pretended *indifferent Things*. And I ſhewed, that no Authority upon Earth could be ſufficient to conſtitute any mere poſitive Rights and Inſtitutions in *Matters of Religion*, and to exclude Men from the *Church of Chriſt*,

in

in caſe of Non-complyance. Now your Anſwer to this is wholly evaſive, and perfectly trifling, and a full Proof that you can take nothing in Hand without ſpoiling it: For here you put yourſelf to the Expence of ſeveral Pages in Quotations from the learned Writers of the Church, to prove that they do not look upon theſe confeſſedly *indifferent* Things to be *neceſſary*; but that the Inſtitutions of Chriſt are compleat and perfect without them; as Baptiſm, for inſtance, without the Sign of the Croſs. And you might have added, without Sponſers or Sureties, and that unaccountable Method of Baptizing by Proxy, and of one Perſon's believing and repenting for another.

Now this, *Sir*, you may remember was the very Objection which I made; that theſe human Inſtitutions being profeſſedly indifferent and needleſs, the tacking them to the Inſtitutions of Chriſt, and denying People what is *neceſſary*, unleſs they will comply with what you own to be unneceſſary, muſt therefore be the more unreaſonable and inexcuſable, and ſuch as muſt needs leave the Impoſers ſelf-condemned. But to this you have ſaid nothing; and that for a very good Reaſon, becauſe nothing

nothing could be ſaid. The Church caſts out her weakeſt Children, her Babes and Sucklings, and ſuch as have moſt need of her Compaſſion, and leaves them to periſh with Famine, unleſs they can find Proviſion elſewhere: And yet at the ſame Time you cry out how tenderly you regard them, and how willing you are to receive them, while you will not part with the leaſt Trifle for the Salvation of their Souls.

The Government indeed has been more wiſe and merciful, and granted them a legal Toleration, which has kept them from periſhing, and for which as is evident they owe no Thanks at all to the Church. But the Author of the *Reflections* had neither Wit nor Mercy; he was reſolved that the Toleration ſhould be of no Service at all to the Diſſenters, and therefore he roundly declares them altogether to be a Pack of the moſt wicked and ungodly Schiſmaticks, whoſe Sin is as great as *Treaſon* or *Horſe-ſtealing*, and as evident, as that *a Triangle has three Sides as well as three Corners.* At the ſame Time he falls foul upon a Right Reverend Prelate of the Church, and charges him with advancing a moſt wick-

ed

ed and fatal Notion of Sincerity, which muſt needs lead Men into, and harden and encourage them in Sin. And all this for no other Reaſon in the World that I could ſee, but becauſe that Prelate, who now happens to be his Dioceſan, had defended the *Church* upon Principles conſiſtent with the Nature of Religion, the Authority of God and Conſcience, and the common Rights and Liberties of all Mankind.

Theſe, *Sir*, are the true Grounds upon which I ventured to attack the learned Author, and without which he had never heard from your humble Servant by Way of Oppoſition; but he might have gone on to reform the Deiſts and Free-Thinkers of the Age, in his own Way, without any Hindrance from me. But I hope he will not ſay, that the Biſhop of *Sarum* and all his Friends in the Church, with the Diſſenters in general, are, in this odious Senſe, Deiſts, and Free-Thinkers. This, I hope, was Reaſon ſufficient for my anſwering the Author of the *Reflections*. But what you pretend, that I wrote againſt him from mere *Spite* and perſonal Prejudice, is utterly falſe and groundleſs. I had reſolved upon

upon and begun the Answer before I had any the least Intimations about the Author: And therefore it could not be owing to any personal Prejudice, unless you can suppose me to have been under any particular personal *Obligations* to him, which ought to have induced me to lay aside the Design, as soon as I came to know who was my Adversary; but I had no personal *Prejudice*, nor *Obligation*, and therefore wrote as to that with the utmost Impartiality.

Now since you have dropt this main Cause, and left your Friend in the *Lurch*, and intirely destitute of *Help*, where he was most of all in Distress, I cannot think but he will be ashamed of your Defence. And I believe you could not upon this Occasion dissemble your own Confusion, if you did not comfort yourself with the Imagination that your Face is covered, and that acting thus in Masquerade no Body knows you.

I had blamed the Author for charging the Lusts and Vices of the Deists upon their Principles: But you take me up for it, and say, *that, on the contrary*, he charged their Principles upon their Lusts

and Vices. The Truth is he has done both: Sometimes he repreſents the Principles as pregnant with all Wickedneſs, and at other Times he inverts that Order, and derives the wrong Principles from the wrong Practice; and indeed he could not be the Man he is, if he did not in every Thing contradict himſelf.

You endeavour to juſtify the Author's Account of the Spirit, by producing a long Quotation from 52.--58. out of Dr. *Cheyne's Philoſophical Principles of Natural Religion*, as you tell me; tho' in that Edition of the Book I have by me, there is not one Word of the Matter in the Places you refer to, nor any where elſe; but as 'tis poſſible there may be after Editions of the ſame Book which I have not ſeen, I ſhall take the Quotation at preſent as Dr. *Cheyne's*.

I thought I had ſufficiently mortified you as to this trifling, in quoting *Authorities* inſtead of *Arguments*. But I ſee this petty retail peddling Trade is all that your Stock will reach to, and you muſt do this, or ſit ſtill, and not be able to *turn the Penny*.

But

But this Quotation is to let me ſee, *that* Britannicus *was not ſingular in his Opinion*; and, I ſuppoſe, to convince me farther, that you are a very *ſingular Writer*. I had ſhewn your Friend's Diſcourſe of the Spirit to be abſurd unintelligible, and contrary to Reaſon and Scripture; and this by Arguments which 'tis plain you are not able to anſwer, ſince you have not dared to attempt it.

Now either Dr. *Cheyne* agrees with *Philelutherus Britannicus* herein or not. If not, the Quotation is nothing to the Purpoſe; But if he does, the ſame Arguments which have been urged againſt the one will hold good againſt the other, and which have never yet been anſwered.

What I had ſaid to ſettle and clear up the true Meaning of that Scripture Diſtinction between *Body*, *Soul*, and *Spirit*, you take no Notice of, but call my ridiculing your Friend's Enthuſiaſm and Nonſenſe, *prophane Drollery*, and what diſcovers *a deplorable Ignorance of Scripture*. But however let my Notion of that Matter ſtand, if you pleaſe, as if it was *Truth* and *Soberneſs*, and the right

Senſe of Scripture, 'till you can find ſomething in anſwer to it.

And now if I have omitted or overlooked any Thing material in the Argument, I am ſure it is not willingly; and if it ſhould happen ſo, I ſhall be ready to make Amends for it, upon any proper Occaſion, by doing the Author farther Juſtice.

As for you, *Sir*, ſince you have choſen to bury yourſelf alive, I hope you will not blame me for it: You declare you will write no more upon any Provocation whatever: I think this is a very prudent Reſolution: You have done enough, you have exerciſed your Talent, and 'tis high Time to take your Leave. There is nothing, I think, odd in the Matter but this, that you ſhould die before you were born, and that ſo great a Man as Mr. *Nisbett*, the *Briſtol Letter-Writer*, ſhould be loſt before he was found.

Some are apt to imagine, that Mr. *Nisbett* is a Club of learned Clergymen in and about this Town; others think, that he is not a Man, though he has taken a Man's Name, but a certain hyſterical Woman,

man, who has written two Letters as an Expedient to throw off the Suffocations of the Mother, and relieve her ſelf under the Vapours. But others again, and perhaps with more Probability, are of Opinion that Mr. *Nisbett* is *no Body*, and that 'tis impoſſible he ſhould be any Body, becauſe he is not *himſelf*. Amidſt this Variety of Opinions and Judgments about ſo weighty a Matter, I hope the contending Parties will bear with one another, as I can eaſily bear with you, *Sir*; ſince, as I doubt not, but you meant well, ſo I think 'tis certain that you have done no Hurt.

I am,

Marlborough,
May 13, 1724.

SIR,

Your humble Servant,

T. M.

FINIS.